

REMARKS

Rejection of claims 19-29 under 35 U.S.C. §101

The examiner rejected claims 19-29 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 20-23 have been cancelled herein, and therefore need not be addressed. Claim 19 has been amended herein to recite “recordable media bearing the web page development environment.” Claim 19 as amended is thus directed to an article of manufacture comprising software in (A) residing in recordable media in (B). Such an article of manufacture is clearly statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the examiner’s rejection of claims 19 and 24-29 under 35 U.S.C. §101 in light of the amendment to claim 19 herein.

Rejection of claims 1-2, 9, 19-22 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The examiner rejected claims 1-2, 9, 19-22 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith III in view of Story. Claims 2 and 20-22 have been cancelled herein, and therefore need not be addressed. The independent claims in this group, namely claims 1, 10 and 19, have been amended to include limitations from some of the former dependent claims that have been cancelled herein. In addition, these claims have been amended to recite processing the plurality of links in a web page, and if multiple links in the web page are identical and point to a same page, changing at least one of the multiple links to assure each of the plurality of links in the web page is unique. In the rejection of claim 3, the examiner cited Toivonen as allegedly teaching the disambiguator recited in former claim 3, which is now in claim 1 as amended. Toivonen discloses descriptively naming links to facilitate subsequent identification of the links. Toivonen Abstract. The links being named in Toivonen are links “such as bookmarks, favorites, recommendation links, search result links, and the like.” Toivonen at col. 2 lines 15-16. Toivonen is directed to the naming of new links, not changing existing links. Nowhere does Toivonen teach or suggest processing existing links in a web page, and if multiple links in the web page are identical and point to a same page, changing at least one of the multiple links to assure each of the plurality of links in the web page is unique. As a result, claims 1, 10 and 19 as amended are allowable over the combination of art cited by the examiner. Applicant respectfully

requests reconsideration of the examiner's rejections of claims 1, 9, 19 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in light of the amendments herein.

Rejection of claims 3-5, 7, 23-25 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The examiner rejected claims 3-5, 7, 23-25 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith III in view of Story and Toivonen. Claims 3 and 23 have been cancelled herein, and therefore need not be addressed. Claims 4-5 and 7 depend on claim 1, which is allowable for the reasons given above. Claims 24-25 and 27 depend on claim 19, which is allowable for the reasons given above. As a result, claims 4-5, 7, 24-25 and 27 are allowable as depending on allowable independent claims. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the examiner's rejection of claims 4-5, 7, 24-25 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Rejection of claims 6 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The examiner rejected claims 6 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith III in view of Story, Toivonen and Smith. Claim 6 depends on claim 1, which is allowable for the reasons given above. Claim 26 depends on claim 19, which is allowable for the reasons given above. As a result, claims 6 and 26 are allowable as depending on allowable independent claims. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the examiner's rejection of claims 6 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Rejection of claims 8 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The examiner rejected claims 8 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith III in view of Story and Ronald. Claim 8 depends on claim 1, which is allowable for the reasons given above. Claim 28 depends on claim 19, which is allowable for the reasons given above. As a result, claims 8 and 28 are allowable as depending on allowable independent claims. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the examiner's rejection of claims 8 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Rejection of claims 10 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The examiner rejected claims 10 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith III in view of Rivette. Claim 13 has been cancelled herein, and therefore need not be addressed. Claim 10 includes limitations similar to those in claim 1 discussed above, and is therefore allowable for the same reasons. None of the cited art teaches or suggests processing the plurality of links in a web page, and if multiple links in the web page are identical and point to a same page, changing at least one of the multiple links to assure each of the plurality of links in the web page is unique, as recited in claim 10. As a result, claim 10 is allowable. Claims 12 and 14 depend on claim 10, which is allowable for the reasons given above. As a result, claims 12 and 14 are allowable as depending on an allowable independent claim. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the examiner's rejection of claims 10 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The examiner rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith III in view of Rivette and Ronald. Claim 11 depends on claim 10, which is allowable for the reasons given above. As a result, claim 11 is allowable as depending on an allowable independent claim. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the examiner's rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

New claims 30-33

Claims 30-33 have been added herein. Claims 30-32 recite the visual indication for a selected link comprises change of font size in text corresponding to the selected link. None of the cited art teach or disclose change in font size in text corresponding to the selected link as a visual indication of frequency of use of a selected link. As a result, claims 30-32 are allowable. In addition, claims 30-32 each depend on an independent claim that is allowable for the reasons given above. As a result, claims 30-32 are also allowable as depending on allowable independent claims.

Claim 33 includes many details supported in the disclosure that were previously unclaimed. Nowhere does any of the cited art nor their combination teach or suggest the unique combination of limitations in claim 33. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claims 30-33.

Petition for Revival

A petition for Revival of an Application for Patent Abandoned Unintentionally under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is submitted herewith. The office action dated 05/01/2008 was addressed to the undersigned attorney, but was never received by his office. The failure to respond to the pending office action was therefore unintentional.

Conclusion

In summary, none of the cited prior art, either alone or in combination, teach, support, or suggest the unique combination of features in applicants' claims presently on file. Therefore, applicants respectfully assert that all of applicants' claims are allowable. Such allowance at an early date is respectfully requested. The examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if this would in any way advance the prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By /derekpmartin/
Derek P. Martin
Reg. No. 36,595

MARTIN & ASSOCIATES, L.L.C.
P.O. Box 548
Carthage, MO 64836-0548
(417) 358-4700